



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/507,195	09/09/2004	Adrianus Johannes Stephanes Maria De Vaan	NL 020195	4192

24737 7590 09/04/2007
PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS
P.O. BOX 3001
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510

EXAMINER

KOSTAK, VICTOR R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2622

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

09/04/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/507,195

Applicant(s)

DE VAAN ET AL.

Examiner

Victor R. Kostak

Art Unit

2622

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2-7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: ____.

Art Unit: 2622

1. Applicant declined to include section headings with his specification in response to the last Office action, and referred to a citation in the Official Gazette in an effort to justify such which says that using the format laid out in section 77 is not mandatory.

Applicant has however complied with that rule. His specification follows that format but lacks the corresponding section headings. Because applicant has gone with the format outlined in section 77(b), those headings now "*should be*" included, as expressly specified in rule 77(c).

Arguing from a more practical viewpoint, the Office prefers that layout with those headings for a reason, of which applicant should be aware. It should go without saying that the format of a patent, being a public document made available for anyone to peruse, should be laid out in a convenient and readable format. When patents are printed in what can be considered a standard format so established by the Office, the public should accordingly recognize its convenient layout and become used to seeing that format. That format enables ready identification of the sections of the disclosure due to the headings, allowing the reader to focus right to any section of the patent. Applicant likely recognized that when he was directed to the patents applied against his claims.

Improved presentation - moreover, that which benefits the public (or any reader) - should precede the alternative of being consistent with a traditional format.

2. Applicant's amendment submitted in response to the rejection based on Field has been considered in full.

However, the following rejection is now presented in light of the newly found art.

The examiner regrets prolonging prosecution.

Art Unit: 2622

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over either of Lehnert '386 or '488 in view of Matis.

Lehnert ('386 or '488) recognizes that display systems such as a rear projection type (col. 2 line 68) can be subject to a pincushion distortion (Fig. 1; e.g. col. 2 lines 59-66).

Although he counters the distortion by applying electronic image framing signals, he recognizes that physical masking is a typical alternative (such as by an escutcheon: col. 1 lines 27-30), and for rear projection systems (col. 2 line 67 – col. 3 line 3). He does not illustrate or describe the actual cabinetry or internal components therein.

Nonetheless, in view of his explicit disclosure and in view of the well known and typical rear projection unit and components as disclosed by Matis internal to the cabinet (Fig. 1), it would accordingly have been obvious to mask the pincushion distortion by such framing (or escutcheon) wherein the rectangular opening (disclosed by Lehnert, flush view not shown by Matis) would have curved top and bottom framed edges as well as the sides (noting again Fig. 1 of Lehnert), thereby meeting claim 2.

As for claim 3, the curved framing would naturally be directed towards the opening.

As for claim 4, the cross-section of the rectangular cabinet opening of Lehnert/Matis (which accommodates the screen) is in a plane parallel to the front surface of the screen, its sides being curved (to hide the pincushion distortion).

Art Unit: 2622

Regarding claim 5, the curvature of the sides and the top/bottom pairs are similar as they counter the visual pincushion effect (caused by the projector) equally.

As for claims 6 and 7, the sides are curved towards the center of the screen, and curved inwardly (noting the masking of the pincushion).

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Victor R. Kostak whose telephone number is (571) 272-7348.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 6:30am-3:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David W. Ometz can be reached on (571) 272-7593. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Art Unit: 2622

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

Or faxed to:

(571) 273-8300

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 308-HELP.



Victor R. Kostak
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2622

VRK